

Ireland vol 15.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

Mr. FOSTER's SPEECH.

11 April 1799

ORIGINATIONS

NO

MR. FORSTER



OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

SPEECH

OF

THE RIGHT HONORABLE

JOHN FOSTER,

SPEAKER

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF IRELAND,

DELIVERED THERE, APRIL 11, 1799.

By a GENTLEMAN at the Bar.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, AND SOLD BY J. DOWNES,
NO. 24C, STRAND, NEAR TEMPLE BAR; AND J. HATCHARD,
PICCADILLY, OPPOSITE BURLINGTON-HOUSE.

1799.

OBSERVATIONS

SPEECH



JOHN FOSTER,

SPEAKER

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF IRELAND,

Delivered in the House of Commons, April 18, 1793.

By a GENTLEMAN of the Bar.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, AND SOLD BY J. DOWD,
NO. 24, ST. MARK'S, MARK LANE, LONDON.
PRINTED BY G. BARNARD, ST. MARK'S LANE.

1793

OBSERVATIONS, &c.

MR Foster opens his speech, in which, after slightly noticing the subject before the committee in which it is delivered, on the Regency, he descends immediately to an observation which is no credit either to individual liberality, national dignity, or grammatical precision. It is that, 10,000 copies of Mr Pitt's speech (on the Union) "have been circulated *gratis*, all of which have been paid for". The expense of 10,000 copies of a shilling pamphlet must utterly ruin the finances of a kingdom in the prosperous state described by the speaker; especially as they have been circulated *gratis*.

Without stopping to inquire into the great authorities of Mr. Debreth, or Mr. Fox, the conviction of my mind obliges me to agree with the present Irish Premier "That the evils under which at this moment Ireland labors, have arisen out of the settlement of 1782."

The general nature of the subject, its own evidence, the effects of the settlement of 1782,—and the repeated calls upon Great Britain,—produce a variety of arguments in support of Lord Castlereagh's assertion.

But to rest my arguments in support of this opinion on ideals, would be travelling the path so generally frequented by lunatics; to build them upon the theoretic speculations of the human mind, would lead me into the parterre of transient hypotheses; and to form my conclusions without consulting experience, would draw me into an inextricable labyrinth; or to the verge of that precipice from which so many patriots have tumbled headlong into the deep gulph of irretrievable folly.

Experience, the unerring amanuensis of wisdom, it is that has given her *verdict* on this subject; and that verdict is, that the present evils of Ireland have arisen out of the settlement of 1782. For if the power to direct the affairs of Ireland had remained with Great Britain as before that settlement, or rather, as is intended by an Union, the latter would never have suffered Ireland to be in her present state.

I cannot persuade myself, even to dream, that the settlement of 1782 was more than a mere *delegation of power*, for the purpose of experiment. I believe it was so considered by all the profound politicians of that day; and I am sure it must by all who deserved that appellation.

It is not originally prescribed in the constitution, that Ireland should legislate for herself *independently*. It formed no part of the hereditary succession of the present family on the throne; and of course that settlement could never be made a principle of the constitution. It must, therefore, be indebted for its existence and continuance to the permission, or authority, of the British legislature; who gave, and who have consequently, the right to take away, whenever experience should teach its rulers that continuance would be mischievous.

Experience has certainly taught that the effects of the present settlement are mischievous; and that the mischief calls aloud for redress—This call is reiterated and general; it

arises out of distress; and if relief does not speedily come, the people of Ireland must be overwhelmed.

It must be understood, however, that this doctrine is to be justified by the *manner* in which this settlement was acquired. Had it been the effect of cool, deliberate, and *uninfluenced* consent the case might have been otherwise. Will not the same means used to obtain that settlement justify the adoption of similar means to break it? An assent so obtained ought not to be considered as a consent conclusive, final, or binding, one moment longer than it should be convenient to alter it; for it was in fact the mere cold formality only, and not the warm will of pure approbation. The enemies to my arguments may say, they are very slender, but I will ask such gentlemen, what they would think of the right of possession of property burglariously obtained by an armed banditti; and I know their answer. Should Great Britain use force in the present case it will be different, because it could, at worst, only amount to a *recovery* of her own property.

If these arguments were not to be disputed, the point would be decided; but I will proceed for the purpose of viewing the subject in the light Mr. Foster has placed it.

That Right Hon. Gentleman says "The noble Lord (Castlereagh) copies his brother minister in ambiguity of expression, as well as in his positions; the minister says, "what *puts an end* to any thing is not *final*."—This quotation, by the marked manner in which it is delivered, seems to be deemed a valuable detection of ambiguity in the opinion of Mr. Foster, but in *my* opinion, can be easily answered by the most *minor* logician in the Kingdom.

What school-boy cannot prove that although an end was put to the battle between Lord Nelson's and the French fleets, off *Aboukir*, yet that a final period was not put to

fighting; or to bring it closer home; that although an end was put to Mr. Foster's speech, yet that a final period was not put to speaking: And it is probable that the Right Honorable Gentleman will hear something more of an Union from his friend Mr. Pitt.

The Right Hon. Speaker says "our *denial* of the British claim gave rise to the *glorious* settlement of 1782; it "removed all those evils which this project of a Union "would again heap upon this Kingdom; and when the "British minister wants us to give up that constitution "which was *then* confirmed to us, &c, &c."

The time and manner of that denial, were no proofs of the *loyalty* of the people who made it—and to arm at a moment when Great Britain was struggling against the best part of Europe coalesced, was not the most honorable proof of *true* courage ever exhibited—I think it both right and necessary to think *that* settlement, so gained in 1782, if not extorted from the British Government by a ***** armed force, was given through a *momentary* Policy which ought to be retracted by a permanent one—I have not forgotten how that indignity operated upon *my* feelings; and I think now, as I did then, that it merited chastisement. One part of the community of Ireland has recently attempted to produce a similar event; but punishment *has* followed.—Here however I will pause for the present on that subject, but more anon.

As to the British minister's quotation of recorded opinions, I blame him for not recording *his own* sentiments only on the subject of an Union; but in all the opinions which have been given on both sides the water nothing has been said directly, that no further measure could ever be taken. Experience has proved that something more is necessary to the happiness and prosperity of Ireland, than the settlement of 1782; and that, therefore, it could be neither complete or

final—as to the *demand* of redress made at that time by Ireland, my opinion has just been given upon it.

And with respect to Mr. Pitt's wanting the constitution of 1782, to be *given* up, it cannot be any such thing, in my opinion; for like an article pledged at a pawnbroker's, the British Government has a right to *take* it, on producing the duplicate, especially as it has regularly paid the enormous interest of 700,000*l.* per annum upon it.

The Right Honorable Speaker has quoted His Majesty's message to the commons for a very opposite construction to that which it was ever intended to convey. The benignity of His Majesty is the constant theme of the whole globe; and it is, indeed, an incalculable blessing that we have such a Monarch—the ways of his heart are such, that there can be no doubt of his being deeply afflicted at the discontents and jealousies which prevailed among his subjects in Ireland; and that benignity of heart and fatherly care with which he ever considers his subjects, prevented him from expressing his *opinion* of those discontents; he only sought to heal them; but the words *final adjustment* never could mean a *preclusion* from doing in *future* that which was *then* so important for him to do, i. e. to heal the wounds of his subjects in Ireland should fresh occasion arise.—What would Mr. Foster have thought in 1782, if his Majesty, instead of acting as he did, had said that the Government of Ireland was already finally fixed; or that it was so at the Revolution; and that he could not, therefore, interfere. How dreadful a sentence would have this proved to Ireland? It does then appear egregiously absurd, *that* gentleman should rise up in the most determined opposition to measures which experience has proved to be absolutely indispensable—which, indeed, have saved and renovated Ireland—It is, I say, unaccountable thus to attempt to raise an Eternal barrier against British interference, (by the ideal of a final settlement) which often

has rescued Ireland from self-raised destruction—which the situation, temper and state of the country frequently render necessary, and will often demand—and which is extremely important at this juncture.

Not a single instance is pointed out in this gentleman's speech in which the interference of Great Britain has *not* proved an advantage to Ireland. In this light Mr. Foster has viewed the settlement of 1782, by his panegyric of *glorious settlement*; and if this has been the uniform effect of British interference, it must be inferred, that its opposers are either *mistaken*, or that they cannot be *real* friends to their country.

The address of the Commons of Ireland, quoted so carefully by the speaker, raises in the mind a variety of unpleasant reflections—The Commons of Ireland, might at the particular crisis, when that address was sent, circumstanced, situated, and *supported* as they were at that time, and which has been herein alluded to, be induced to use the language they did, especially as they were then encouraged by the example of America—but the taking an unfair and, perhaps, unmanly advantage of armed power to make a daring demand, or to advance daring assertions, does not prove either the *justice* of such demand, or the *truth* of those assertions.—In this precise light I am forced to look upon that business—I cannot help it; nor does the circumstance of making that quotation exhibit any great moderation in the Right Honorable Gentleman's temper; and it would be at least judicious in him to recollect that the *then* volunteers of Ireland are not *now* in arms.

In that address there is one very *modest* declaration, and so conspicuous as to require no explanation or comment, more than to remark that they did not go *quite* so far in their desires as to wish to deprive his Majesty of that right.

It therefore went "to assure His Majesty that His Majesty's Commons of Ireland do most sincerely wish, that all bills which become law in Ireland, should receive the approbation of His Majesty, under the Seal of Great Britain."

It seems a little remarkable, that after the magnanimous, generous, and paternal benevolence of the British Monarch, &c. in which was bestowed upon the Irish nation all that was asked; and for which *they* gave assurance that no constitutional question between the two nations could any longer exist, that in less than 17 years a Rebellion should arise in that country, which threatened its total separation from the one which had acted in the exalted manner just alluded to. I do not make this remark with any other view than to shew the *gratitude* and temper of the people of Ireland—ever rebellious—ever dissatisfied—ever receiving—and ever demanding—ever irregular—and ever troublesome—ever settling—and ever unsettled.

At the close of the then session of the Irish Parliament, in the address to the Lord Lieutenant are these words "We shall have seen this great national arrangement established on a basis which secures the tranquility of Ireland."

Here then comes to our view a very important point—This settlement of 1782, was in the opinion of the *Irish* legislature so wisely conducted as to be established on a basis which secures the tranquility of Ireland—Has the tranquility of Ireland been secured by it? No. It was inefficient for that purpose. If then those proceedings were inefficient, how could they be conclusive? How can proceedings be conclusive and *final* that were inefficient, and, consequently, not right? There has been a rebellion, and that a most dangerous one—if there has been a most dangerous rebellion, the tranquility of Ireland could not be secured; and if Ireland under its present "GLORIOUS SETTLEMENT," fixed in 1782, has no security for its tranquility, the measures adopt-

ed, for that purpose, are proved by experience to be unsound; and if they are unsound, reason, common sense and experience direct, may force the attention to other measures—What then are those measures to be that will positively secure the tranquility of Ireland? Certainly none of the various measures adopted previous to the settlement of 1782. For dreadful experience has proved in the most pointed, and positive terms, that the settlement of 1782 has produced, or suffered, more violence upon the tranquility of Ireland, and threatened it with worse mischief, than ever happened at any one period before the so much boasted glorious settlement of 1782—it threatened no less a mischief than its *injure separation* from the British Empire, and of adding its strength to the most dangerous Enemy on the whole Globe. Will Great Britain suffer this?

—It is against British interference in the affairs of Ireland, which Mr. Foster so determinedly raises all his powers; and, of course, against the tranquility, welfare, and security of Ireland; because without the interference of Great Britain it cannot be hazarding too much to say, that Ireland would at this moment have been a Province of France,—dictated to imperiously—submitting unconditionally—suffering without redress—and, I may add, expiring without pity.

Without the interference of Great Britain, I repeat, this would have been the situation of Ireland; and yet Mr. Foster is the most determined opposer of all British interference.

That unavoidable interference of Great Britain, the necessity for which, the “GLORIOUS settlement” of 1782, could not prevent, has cost her an immense expence,—it therefore behoves Great Britain to endeavour to avoid these repeated calls upon her—these reiterated expences, perplexity and trouble; all which prove in a way so forcible as

to bear down every opposition, that the *glorious* settlement of 1782, was a mere theoretic experiment, which cannot, because it has not secured the tranquility of Ireland—and how in the name of common sense can any thing be final, when it *concludes nothing*, unless it has concluded the tranquility of Ireland, by opening the avenues to every species of disorder, and to the most dreadful insecurity and rebellion. If, therefore, it has not finally concluded the dangers, disorders, and mischiefs to which Ireland was subject previous to the Glorious theory of 1782, it has concluded nothing; and having done nothing for seventeen years, and being unable to secure the tranquility of Ireland in the seventeenth year, it is unequal to the purposes for which it was instituted, and being so unequal, is useless, and being useless, experience teaches that the constitutional ability of that settlement is merely ideal, practically insufficient, and therefore, ought to be *instantly annihilated*.

This experience; this reasoning; 700,000 other reasons annually; and an occasional million for the suppression of rebellion, or resistance to an enemy; very forcibly teach the British Government, the fatal and unhappy lesson, that the present state of things in Ireland is radically wrong; and if they be wrong, and the methods which have been heretofore tried, have been proved so by experience, surely it is high time for some mode to be adopted which shall procure the end desired; and, perhaps, that end can *only* be found in an Union.

Perhaps the Right Hon. Speaker has not been careful to draw the comparison between the actual state of Ireland, and his own theoretic notions, which *divert* his attention quite away from the scene before him;—and, if this is really the case, what should I say? Perhaps, however, he views in

that strange theory, the state of Ireland as it *should* be, and not as it *is*; or else why the expression respecting the settlement of 1782, that "it removed all those evils which the project of an Union would again heap upon this kingdom," at the moment those evils are actually in the highest heaps of confusion and rebellion ever known; or is it expressed by the rule of contraries, that what actually exists does not exist, and vice versâ.

But, indeed, there appears to me a very clever policy in this mode of statement, for the Right Hon. Gentleman must be aware that if the *glorious* settlement of 1782, was fully calculated to secure the tranquility of Ireland, and that tranquility was broken down every where by disorder, violence, and rebellion, *responsibility* would be required somewhere, for the *mal-administration* of that policy infused into the *glorious* settlement of 1782, stated to be so highly competent to *secure* the tranquility of Ireland, which it had *not* done.

If Mr. FOSTER considers Great Britain as the only enemy of Ireland, and is proud of obtaining advantages from her, and of setting up a barrier against her *alone*, why then the case is different; but if Great Britain is considered as the Friend of Ireland, studying to enrich and exalt her, why all this exultation on the attainment of advantages, and from *her* only.

I cannot discover that any of the remarks on the speech of the then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, on proroguing the parliament, embrace any one individual consideration in favor of the body of the *people* of Ireland, which ought, in my opinion, to be the paramount object of every legislator: but, they go directly to the point of *individual* consideration as to the persons of the legislators. It is an unerring maxim,

that good is good whether done by this or that power, or that, or the other man; that good to the people of Ireland would still be good, whether done by Mr. Pitt, or by Mr. Flood; and, that whether the people of Ireland be made prosperous and happy by an independent legislature in Ireland, or an Imperial independent one in England, does not amount to the value of a straw. Personal consideration, arising out of individual political consequence, seems therefore, to be ground work of these objections and arguments, and that being the case, they are *beneath* the great objects of national policy; and which is that of the British legislature in their proposition of an Union.

The high sounding and emphatic remarks on the Thanksgiving in consequence of the favors granted by the British legislature, express nothing to the purpose before us, more than impassioned words; and, therefore, I shall pass over them. And as to the chagrine of the Speaker, so apparent on the observations on Mr. Pitt's speech, I must give the Right Hon. Gentleman credit for his acknowledgement of his disappointment there; for it happens not to be sufficiently vulnerable to allow it to be attacked and exposed to any advantage.

The bill introduced in the Lord's House of Great Britain, on the 17th of May, for the purpose of establishing the interests and happiness of both kingdoms, on a solid and permanent basis; the resolutions of the Commons at the same time; their address to the King; and the subsequent proceedings thereon; do not in any place point out the *security* to be given, that the conduct of the Government of Ireland should be such as *never more to render it necessary* for the British Government to be called upon. Had even, indeed, the glorious settlement of 1782, prevented it, the British Government would perhaps not have thought of further

measures. It might be understood, that if the Government of Ireland could so act under the power of the settlement of 1782, so as to "secure the tranquillity," and establish the interests and happiness of Ireland upon a permanent basis, the British Legislature would be glad of it, with all their hearts; and, as a proof of that disposition they gave every power to the Irish Legislature which they could think of, or did "*demand*," for that purpose; and so much did the then Legislators of Ireland, think their *infallible* wisdom, and *united* power had obtained, that Mr. Foster says, they actually called upon Almighty God, to receive their solemn thanks for his blessings, &c. but even all this has produced, not the end desired, but the very reverse.—It has raised a few gigantic legislators; and it has produced insecurity, disorder, and a rebellion, which it appears, they had not power or wisdom enough finally to crush; and would have produced a total separation of the two kingdoms, had not the British Government interfered, and by their wisdom and power, rescued that kingdom once more from destruction. But, there was nothing in that settlement to proscribe Great Britain from taking further measures; or that should prevent the necessity of them.

Experience having proved, therefore, that the contract of the People of Ireland has not been kept—that they have not been able to keep that contract—the power which had been so generously, so liberally, and so magnanimously conferred, reverts back to the British Legislature; and, this, I believe, sound reason, the policy of politics, and the good of the two kingdoms manifest in terms indelibly forcible.—And as experience has proved that all the schemes without exception, including the "glorious settlement of 1782," have failed of success, the attention is naturally and unavoidably directed to the British Legislature; who are called upon to devise some competent means to prevent the like

ruptures of future settlements; and a Union is the most likely regulation to produce that effect of any thing that perhaps was ever suggested.

It is somewhat observable, that the Right Hon. Speaker should, in the same sentence, in which he has spoken of the solemn thanks of the Irish Nation to the Deity, for the settlement of 1782, rendered no doubt, *complete and eternal* from the purity, sincerity, *judiciousness*, and solemnity of those thanks; be so *uncharitable* towards Mr. Pitt, as he was, for telling him that a contract which the Irish People had *broken*, could not be *whole*; or, in other words, that the pitcher of the glorious settlement of 1782, had been shattered to atoms by the insecure state of Ireland, or by a Rebellion; which could not be finally suppressed without the aid of a power, paramount to both that dreadful event and the glorious settlement of 1782.

It follows of consequence, that the settlement would have received its final dissolution from these two circumstances, had there been no other; even if it had been originally intended they should be final; so that it is a mere joke to assert, that the British Minister desires "the demolition of a nation's prayer, and of a nation's thanks; for the foundation on which they rested, has been demolished by the national insecurity, crying situation, and pitious distress of Ireland, arising out of the "glorious settlement of 1782."

All that I have been able to learn from the Constitution of the dominions under the sovereignty of the British Monarch, has not afforded me one solitary proof that Ireland is intitled by that Constitution to a separate and independent Legislature. And I am convinced from my researches, that such a right is no where to be found in the Constitution. I am persuaded therefore, it has crept in by *sufferance* in

times less enlightened than the present, but was nevertheless an irruption into the British constitution; yet an inconsistency of this sort might silently be suffered to exist, provided no circumstances arose to expose the empire to mischief or danger through it; either of which would manifest the folly and absurdity of its existence. Another reason may also be admitted viz. that it might gratify human vanity to participate in the offices of legislation; and *some* persons are pleased by the *shadow* of consequence. This departure from the constitution has been suffered while it continued inoffensive; but, whenever the pride of its possessors should lead it beyond its proper limits, it is then time to interpose the barrier of the genuine constitution. Here, then, the paramount power of the constitution must arrest its progress to prevent mischief; and it comes with its truly legitimate and dignified authority, like Jove in his imperial car, to frown the spurious bastard into his native nothingness. This was the case with Scotland; and is the case with Ireland; whose independent legislature may, with the strictest adherence to the principles of the constitution of the empire, be annihilated by the British Legislature, *separately*, without even descending to consult Ireland on the subject; and proceed to a foederal union of the two kingdoms. As the matter stands at present, there does not appear to me any power in the constitution which shall prevent the king from ordering returns to his writs for members for Ireland, to be made at Westminster, and that those members shall actually sit there, with those of Great Britain; and *not* in a separate assembly in Ireland; and if this be the case, the king *alone* has the power to effect an Union by this single constitutional act; and the only difference then, from that proposed by the Union, will be the sitting of *Five*, instead of *One* hundred Irish members in the Imperial legislature.

From this it appears, that the present method in which the Union is proposed, is the complaisant laying aside the laws of

constitutional right, for the purpose of allowing the people of Ireland the individual pleasure of *assent*; but which, however, is in reality nothing more than an act of complaisance in the constitutional officers.

Let us *look* at the Constitution.——The British Constitution has the whole of its principles inherent in the kingly office, fixed and unalterable; and the people have established laws by which the Realm shall be governed. The Privy Council are the constituted advisers of the king, and their advice is given in a way which excludes the possibility of His acting wrong in the exercise of the Kingly office. Those advisers are responsible for the consequences of their advice; but the King is not responsibly for *their* actions, as he only nominates the persons of the Privy Counsellors, the office of the Privy Council already existing in the first principles of the Constitution—by the Constitutional Laws of the Realm. The King and the Privy Council are the first and complete principles of the Constitution; they will exist as long as the people; because, by being the Soul of the Constitution they are immortal.

The Privy Council is the first order between the King and the People, and yet so blended with the Kingly office as to constitute a part of it, as the King personally cannot act without it; so that, in fact, the King and Council, in Council, execute the Kingly office, which is the King, and which is the Foundation of the Constitution.

The Lords and Commons Houses of Parliament, are the next order, emanating from the King; and there is a variety of other offices also emanating from this grand, first, essential principle of the constitution——State Officers, Judges, Sheriffs, Magistrates, &c. &c. &c. and indeed, every Office

and Officer essential to the prosperity, security, and happiness of the people,

Parliaments have been judged to be proper and excellent Institutions for the purpose of extending the benefits of the constitution; but although they are called into activity by the principles of the constitution, which all centre in the King; yet it does not follow, that they are as immortal as the King; because, whenever they cease to act, as by a dissolution, for instance, the *then* parliament expires, and is of course without existence: But the King still remains, and of course all the principles of the constitution. And from the King a new parliament must emanate agreeably to the principles of the constitution, which he calls by his writ: But still, the *old* parliament is finally deceased, and it is a *new* parliament which is called into existence by the principles of the constitution inherent in the King.

It is a fixed principle in the constitution, that parliaments shall be *periodically* called into existence and activity; and the objects of the constitution would be incomplete without them. And their use, value, importance, and dignity, we all well know, justly admire, and highly revere.

I cannot, therefore, say, that the parliaments are ever in existence, because they are occasionally dissolved, or periodically expire; but, in the eye of the constitution, they are ever in theoretic existence so as to be *periodically* called into actual existence, and real activity.

To borrow a more applicable figure from a most intelligent author, and discriminating writer on this subject;—a short time since hastily prosecuted by order of one of the branches of the legislature; on whose trial a jacobin jurymen so indecently expressed his inward gratification, and pre-deter-

mined verdict, could he have had his will; because the gentleman alluded to, had been the means of defeating the first grand struggle of domestic traitors to hurl the kingdom into anarchy and confusion.—That figure runs thus:—

“ The Government of England is a *monarchy*; the
 “ monarch is the antient stock from which have sprung
 “ those goodly branches of the legislature, the lords and
 “ commons, that at the same time give ornament to the
 “ Tree, and afford shelter to those who seek protection
 “ under it. But these are still only Branches, and derive
 “ their origin and their nutriment from their common
 “ parent; they may be lopped off, and the Tree is a Tree
 “ still; shorn indeed of its honors, but not, like them,
 “ cast into the fire. The kingly Government may go on,
 “ in all its functions, without Lords or Commons: It
 “ has done so for years together, and in our times it does
 “ so during every recess of parliament; but without the
 “ King his parliament is no more. The King, there-
 “ fore, —alone it is who necessarily subsists, without
 “ change or diminution; and from him alone we un-
 “ ceasingly derive the protection of Law and Govern-
 “ ment.”

If, therefore, the tree can lose its foliage, and yet exist; it may, by the same rule, lose its branches, and yet exist: and, it was for this natural, plain, and just reasoning, *that* gentleman was prosecuted.

If I am asked: do I advise, or wish, the Lords and Commons branches of the legislature to be lopped off? I must startle at the weakness of the question; and, instantly, answer, that nothing can, in any rational manner, imply any thing like it. And if I can read at all, it is evident the

author I have just quoted, never had the most distant idea of any such wish. It is self-evident he only reasoned with just proportion.—And as to his conclusions, they are every season confirmed by the simple operations of nature; and are positively proved by the effects produced on the common timber growing upon the land of every member of parliament in the Kingdom, who has trees growing upon his estates.

I have judged it indispensable to the subject before me, to have recourse to the principles of the Constitution, and the manner of their operation; to shew how the functions of Government are performed; and, particularly, to point out, that those principles do *not* recognise more Offices of Parliament than *one*; or rather more branches of legislature than *two*; the one the Lords, and the other the Commons Parliament: not two houses of Lords, and two houses of Commons, forming two legislatures *independent* of one another: and, therefore, I must conclude, that any other houses of parliament are an infringement or mutilation of the rights, powers, and dignities of those two branches, which are alone, recognised by the constitution.

It is this infringement, or mutilation of the rights, powers, and dignities, of the two recognised branches of the constitution, that so powerfully questions the independence and existence of the Irish Legislature; which thus appears a stranger to the constitution. And, it is the constitutional recognition of the two branches of the British Legislature exclusively, that will shake to its very centre, the right of existence of an independent legislature in Ireland; so unknown to the constitution.

Thus we clearly see how far the right of existence of an independent legislation remains, when viewed through the *optics of the constitution*; and, also, how far the principles of the Union will go to restore to the two branches of the British Legislature, their *own* rights, honors, and dignities.

It is not, therefore, against Mr. Pitt, that Mr. Foster should declaim; but against the restoration of so much of the constitution, as Mr. Pitt, as an organ of the Privy Council, is aiming at.

I beg it may be particularly understood, that although I have used these arguments to assert the authority of the British Government, to effect an Union *without* the consent of Ireland, I by no means recommend such a procedure; for, I conceive, a conciliating and friendly policy to be infinitely preferable and superior to the exercise of power and right, whenever a recourse to them can possibly be avoided. Of this opinion, Lord Shelburne, now MARQUIS of LANSDOWNE, seemed to be, when, on the agitation of the subject of the settlement of 1782, he said, "it would be *wise* to comply with the wishes of Ireland." And of this opinion seemed to be, also, the late Mr. E. Burke, and Mr. Fox; as declared by the latter at a meeting of the Whig Club, held on the 7th of May, 1799; when he said, that Mr. Burke and he were both agreed in *opinion*, that, "Whatever connection was established, it was an indispensable principle, that whatever settlements should be made," (with Ireland) "it *should* flow from the spontaneous feelings and consent of both people."

It is, however, to be remarked, that while these sentiments are thus declared in favor of preferring *consent* to the use of right, the circumstances of these opinions have been *apparently* disputable by them; and, if from that, we deduct

the effect which party influence had upon their minds, at the time they were of this opinion; the time, place, occasion, and manner of their promulgation; and, particularly, the attachment of Mr. Burke to his native country, and the influence he had over Mr. Fox as his *Political Father*; the scale will, perhaps, be completely turned against it. But there is one point which is certain; and to it, I could wish Mr. Foster particularly to attend; which is; that as the conversations of Mr. Burke and Mr. Fox, were held, on this subject, *subsequent* to the settlement of 1782; it is a positive avowal, that *they did not think that settlement FINAL*, but *expected* the matter to go *further* at some subsequent period.

It has been several times repeated by Mr. Foster, in his speech, that the Parliament of Ireland had declared, that "no constitutional question can ever hereafter exist between the two Kingdoms to interrupt their harmony." That the Parliament of *Ireland* did *repeat* those declarations in 1782, is most readily admitted; but it should be also noticed and admitted, that the *British* parliament *never* made that declaration: if, therefore, the Parliament of Ireland were to repeat that declaration for ever, as Mr. Foster seems disposed to do; it will *never* amount to a declaration from the British Parliament.

Mr. Fox, also repeatedly expressed his fears "that Ireland might think of fresh greivances;" and although the Irish Parliament did every thing they then could to remove those fears, *he* still entertained them; and his judgement was sound; for the Commercial Propositions soon followed; a participation of the trade to India was their next desire; and now a most dreadful rebellion, and the incompetent settlement of 1782, have exposed that kingdom to the hazard of a general derangement and disorganization; which prove the *necessity*

of a different system ; and which, is, probably, the design of an Union.

It is a question, whether the settlement of 1782 does not nearly, if not totally, amount to an acknowledgement of an Union of the two kingdoms ; and if it should turn out to be the fact, the task of the British ministry may be less difficult : for in that case, the Independence of that legislature is annihilated. Mr. Foster says that " the act of rendering the Great Seal of Great Britain necessary to the passing an Irish Law, secures Union and Connexion on a firm and lasting basis." If that Right Hon. Gentleman did not consider this as an acknowledgement of a legislative Union ; yet it is some proof that he had a presentiment of its necessity ; and, so far, his private sentiments may be said to have escaped him.

From Mr. Foster's own statement of the Duke of Portland's messages, it is fairly to be inferred, that this was *not* considered a final adjustment by the British Legislature ; for the reason, that the Lord Lieutenant omitted those words in all his messages to the Parliament of Ireland, subsequent to the 27th of May. As to deception in the Duke of Portland, I think him so far above it, that he would have held no situation, whatever, in which it would be necessary for him to be guilty of it in the smallest degree ; and no man, in his senses, will presume to attach such an idea to the Monarch, and the British Parliament. It rather appears to me, that he copied the words from the Parliament of Ireland without marking them ; and that when the British Cabinet found he had used them, it was corrected.

Nor do I think it follows, that any minister dissatisfied with the settlement of 1782, could, with propriety, declare it immediately. And, I am sure, it would have been impolitic ; because, conciliation was then the paramount ob-

ject of the British cabinet—but, a proper opportunity was the time. That opportunity has arrived; and Mr. Pitt, and the British legislature, have declared their opinion on the subject; and at *this* period, it is just as well as it would have been sixteen years ago; and, perhaps, much more proper; all things considered: but if it had not happened until the year 1900, Mr. Foster would have thought it too soon, had he, then, been on this side of purgatory.

The contrasted quotations between the Parliament of Ireland, His Majesty, and Mr. Pitt, prove only the benevolence of the King, the exultation of that parliament, and the opinion of Mr. Pitt: and I perfectly agree with that Right Honorable Gentleman, that it would be better for the people of Ireland if they had no constitution but that of the British Empire, in one general principle and execution, extending over the whole: and, perhaps, Mr. Foster will, in his private thoughts hereafter, agree with Mr. Pitt in this point.

If the Emperor of Germany wished the most responsible trustee for an estate, which would he chuse, Great Britain or Ireland?

If I understand Mr. Foster's speech right; it seems, the people of Ireland greedily received every advantage which this country was inclined to part with; in which the years 1782, 1783, and 1784, were pretty much employed; and for which they returned nothing but words and expressions: in this humor they seem as if they would have swallowed the whole British legislature, its laws, liberties, power, and wealth; and, indeed all its Imperial concerns whatever; and have transferred them to Dublin, without any hesitation, or repugnance. Had they evinced some concern, or shewn some trifling repugnance for all that Great Britain was

giving away, it might, perhaps, have been something towards a proof of their wishing Great Britain as well as themselves.

From actions, and not from words, the true principles of men are to be gathered. The Duke of Rutland particularly recommends in his speech at the opening of the sessions, "the uniformity of laws and *religion*;" but these important words were but very little noticed, while "a *common interest* in foreign treaties, was re-echoed from the highest of the heavens to the lowest abyfs: such were the corrected, and reciprocal notions of the people of Ireland, at that time.

The partial extracts made from Mr. Pitt's declaration, as they, at present, are given; are mere points of assertion, stripped of their explanatory context, which disguises their positive meaning. The expressions of the Right Honorable speaker, on the other side the water, carry with them such exquisite delight, when any thing arises *favorable to his* objects; and such repugnant expressions, when *against* them; as to disclose his temper, and to merit some contrast and animadversion; and the quotations so carefully selected, will admit of elucidation and exposition. We will, therefore, take the subject as Mr. Pitt understands it, and support our arguments by the identical authorities which Mr. Foster has selected to support his own positions. With this view, it will be, therefore, be first necessary, to revert to the subject of a Fœderal Union with Ireland.

Mr. Foster considers the settlement of 1782 as the second, if not the great *magna charta* of Ireland: but he should mark, that in so doing, he admits the supremacy of the power of Great Britain in being able to *grant* it.

This charter, Mr. Foster says, "has showered down upon Ireland more tradé, more blessings, and more affluence,

"than ever fell to her lot in double the space of time which has elapsed since its attainment." I pray heaven this assertion may be correct.

Admitting it to be so; a question immediately arises out of it, whether Great Britain having the power to grant these pre-eminent benefits, so much extolled; has not, also, the power to grant further, and yet more important benefits; so as at *once*, to place Ireland fully, and completely, upon an equality with Great Britain. If this should be admitted; and, perhaps, no one will dispute it; and if it can be evinced that a Union is competent to it, and likely to effect it; Mr. Foster cannot oppose it, without forcing all those amorous expressions he has uttered in commendation of the settlement of 1782 being *final*, to recoil against his own bosom. And, as to disputing the right of conferring further advantages; it is impossible the Right Honorable Gentleman can attempt it, without libelling, in the strongest possible terms, his own disposition to benefit Ireland; for he has applauded the magnanimity, and generosity of the British legislature, for the advantages already conferred on Ireland, with such profusion of expression, that he will certainly be exhausted by the increased pleasure of apportionately acknowledging those immense benefits and advantages which are arising in the Union.

That the British legislature intended further advantages, is evident from the quotations Mr. Foster, himself, has used, in this speech; and which will elucidate themselves, as has been, and will be seen.

The commons address to the Duke of Rutland towards the close of the sessions of 1782, goes on thus—

"We reflect with true pride and satisfaction on the solid advantages which have been obtained for this country."

“ We are aware of the situation of the Empire, and the
 “ adjustment of some points which concern our trade and
 “ manufactures, and we rely upon the readiness of your
 “ Grace’s liberal and benevolent assistance for the *furtherance*
 “ of such practical measures as deliberate wisdom, and
 “ generous policy may adapt to our real necessities and ge-
 “ neral interests.”—*not a word about constitution,—it was all*
settled! This is, indeed, a very ingenious foreclosure upon the
 mortgage of British generosity; but Mr. Foster will find it
 very difficult to persuade the generality of intelligent men to
 be of the same opinion with him, in that which he attempts
 to establish, by only *nine* words, however ingeniously they
 may be applied or expressed; for a cause in time is apt to
 produce an event in time; and the event of the commercial
 propositions proved that the settlement of 1782, was not
 final; because, Ireland wanted to receive *additional* grants
 from the legislature of Great Britain. The stress is cau-
 tiously laid on the distinction between commercial, and poli-
 tical objects—this veil is, however, too thin a concealment;
 and the act of receiving further favours, or grants, from the
 British Government, proves to a demonstration, two positions;
 one, that the adjustment of 1782, was *not* final; and the other,
 that the British ministry did not think so. It is certain they
 had, at the moment of the settlement of 1782, the commercial
 propositions in their view; but there is no proof whatever
 that they *had not* further political, or constitutional views;
 on the contrary, I have adduced already several proofs that
 they actually had; and, of course, the adjustment of 1782,
 was not considered as final, although the Parliament of Ireland
 took great pains to persuade themselves and the world that
 they were.

The next quotation is from the speech of the Duke of
 Rutland, on the opening of the subsequent session thus,

E

" I am to recommend in the King's name, to your earnest investigation those objects of trade and commerce which have not yet received their final adjustment." I do mark the expression—*which have not yet received their final adjustment*. They are those objects of trade and commerce, which have not received their final adjustment; it expressly says, those (particular) objects. I understand, clearly, that nothing else whatever was intended to be agitated at *that* moment; which, so far from proving, or tending to prove, that nothing ever should, only proves that *one* thing is not *another*.

The rest of the Vice-roy's speech, so far from intimating that there had been a final adjustment, recommends in terms very forcible, the "adoption of such an equitable system as *will* secure mutual satisfaction and permanency," which being subsequent to the supposed "final adjustment," is a most *unfortunate* quotation, when attempted to be made in *favor* of it; especially, as the rest of that speech shews the disposition of the British Government to give "a common interest in treaties with foreign states," with a view *to form* a sure bond of connexion and attachment between the two countries. Mark, not a word of *final* adjustment having taken place; but *subsequent* to the supposed final adjustment, all this is in view; and, consequently, is only necessary to be noticed to stamp the fullest possible conviction on every mind not erroneously made up, that what was not yet scarcely begun, could not be *finally* concluded.

You will observe, says Mr. Foster, "that Treaties with Foreign States are here mentioned; because it shews they were in consideration as part of the commercial subject afterwards declared." This is certainly a very skilful way Mr. Foster has, of getting over a very difficult barrier by a single leap. It is no less a point than determining a

most important and abstruse metaphysical question, on a grand constitutional point, by the school-boy's mode of beginning arithmetic, of *Dot and go one*. My opinion is very different; but God knows, I am but one, against Mr. Foster, who is certainly, both a learned man, and a great speaker; but, my opinion is nevertheless this; that both Mr. Foster and the Speaker, had very great doubts in their own minds, whether a great constitutional question could be solved by a commercial process; and, it should be particularly marked, that whenever these Gentlemen are self-convinced, that the point they are endeavoring to establish, is *against* them; it is a general rule, to leap over them by positive inference thus:—"And here mark the words, the adjustment of some points which concern our trade and manufactures;—not a word about constitution,—it was all settled."

"Mark the expression—*which have not yet received their complete adjustment.*"

For my part, I am so thoroughly persuaded that every object agitated between Great Britain and Ireland, whether distinguished by the term commerce, foreign treaties, or rebellion, is a constitutional question, that I cannot help noticing the singularly sophistical manner attempted to draw a distinction.

These are certainly very skilful manœuvres; because, these most vulnerable points are selected to be expressed in a manner so as not to permit the auditors to have any doubts on them, by the imperious mode in which they are introduced, and expressed. But, it so happens, that although others may take Mr. Foster's positions as their own final creed, and that I might have believed, if I had never known; yet that knowing them, has thrown me into doubt; that

doubt into suspicion; and that doubt, suspicion and knowledge, have taught me scepticism.

On the plan of the Irish propositions being submitted, these words are to be found in the address:—

“That our gratitude is peculiarly due to his Majesty,
 “for the measures which, since last session of Parliament,
 “have been taken by his royal command, *towards* forming
 “an arrangement of commerical intercourse between Great
 “and Ireland. That with the most sanguine hope they
 “*look forward* to the confirmation of these resolutions,
 “containing the principles upon which, they trust, the
 “commercial interests of the two nations *will* be finally
 “established. When these shall be happily and fully
 “carried into effect, through his Majesty’s paternal good-
 “ness, and the wisdom and liberality of his Parliaments of
 “Great Britain and Ireland, they shall, with the most sin-
 “cere satisfaction, behold a system established upon the
 “firm basis of reciprocal advantage, which *will* completely
 “strengthen and cement the common interest and mutual
 “affection of both kingdoms, and *will* indissolubly unite
 “the efforts of all his Majesty’s subjects of Great Britain
 “and Ireland, in maintaining the strength, increasing the
 “resources, and extending the power and credit of the
 “British empire.”

In this address, there is not one word which tends to convey any idea, of a final adjustment having taken place in 1782; but, that the whole are *actual* proceedings towards points *not* adjusted. How, then, is it possible things could be *finally* adjusted, which, at that day, were in the act of being adjusted? It is said, that commercial propositions were the then immediate object; but, who *does* say, and what is *said*, that further adjustments should *never*

be attempted, whatever occasion might thereafter arise to call for them? If, there had been one expression of that sort; and, there most certainly would, had it been meant; I would instantly give up the whole subject; but, in the whole book of *Job*, there is not one such to be found.

It is admitted, Mr. Pitt then said "that his *present* plan was nothing more than a necessary supplement to those which had formerly been adopted"—but, suppose he had then thought proper to have said more; who, would have prevented him?—He did not, then, think proper to say more; but, he does *now* say more. It does not, therefore, follow, that, because he did not *then* say more, he never should; or, that he had no more to say; but, on the contrary, it proves, that he *then* thought further proceedings were necessary; and, he has *now* said so. The Union could not be the thought of *yesterday* only.

Times, circumstances, and things, might render it good policy in Mr. Pitt, at that day, to say no more. The same policy may now, induce him to open his mind. If some benefits, were *then* to the advantage of Ireland; why not, according to the rule of proposition, may not more benefits, *now*, be of importance? It appears, therefore, an unaccountable doctrine; that those persons who were so much affected by the benefits conferred on Ireland; and, who have extolled those benefits in extraordinary terms; should be the most strenuous to oppose the *further* happiness, and prosperity of that people; by opposing a plan, which, as wise and as good men as ever lived, (the British Legislature) know to be well calculated to produce.

Mr. Foster seems, perpetually, to drag our attention to the sole object of the expression—"a final adjustment;" or, in plain and direct words, a *preclusion* to Great Britain

from the right of extending further benefits; and, repeatedly insists, that, *every thing* between the two kingdoms, had been *finally* adjusted; at the very instant they *actually* were in the course of adjustment; which is, in every respect, directly contradictory.—It is like insisting, that to-morrow was yesterday: that 1802*, was 1782; for no other reason, than because, the figures 8, and 2, are in both those numbers; but still he persists.

As to the terms, nostrum, and, poisonous ingredients, applied to Mr. Pitt, on the subject of the Union; they smell strong of the personal pride of the analiser; and, may hurt a medicine; which, administered in 1782, instead of the “glorious settlement,” of that year; would have prevented the French fever, which has so terribly scourged the people of Ireland; and which, experience teaches, requires a more powerful medicine to cure, than the mixture of pride and, featherfew of 1782. An effectual remedy will be found in the *State Recipe*, termed, AN UNION. I know this will be a bitter pill for some to swallow, especially those afflicted with the proud-gravel; but, certainly, the *health* of a whole nation is to be preferred to the *spasms* of a few individuals. It is, doubtless, these sensations, that drew forth Mr. Foster’s impassioned prayer, that Mr. Pitt had never attempted to bring out this radical cure for *all* the disorders of Ireland.

As I am not inclined to use any asperity, I shall pass over the Right Hon. Gentleman’s impassioned sentences, such as, I will stand or fall by the Bill; because I entertain an eccentric notion, that the constitutional habit of a man’s body, is calculated to save, or to damn, his soul. I will, therefore, proceed to the expressions of Mr. Foster, printed

* The year when the Union is likely to be settled.

Woodfall's debates, "That things could not remain as they were." I shall, however, take no other advantage of his expression, than to remark, that, even in Mr. Foster's own opinion, it is impossible things adjusted in 1793, could be adjusted in 1782, and, consequently, that adjustment could not be final which required further adjustment: neither Mr. Foster's speech, therefore, nor any sort of reasoning, can prove that that *is* which is *not*. But the whole honor of Mr. Foster's conduct, and expressions, put me in mind of a miser's advice, to a son formed in his own mould, 'Get all you can, keep all you get, and part with nothing.'

If this were not the prevalent notion, with respect to the settlement of 1782, Mr. Foster would not have asked the question, "Whence is the difference of our situation *now* from what it would have been, had the commercial measures of 1785, been established?" But why, did not that liberality which Mr. Foster calls for, induce him to ask the difference between the state of Ireland on the event of those propositions in 1795, and in 1781; and, an answer of great importance, would have been ready.

If my notions be right, I conceive, that true philosophy is the essence of knowledge, of whatever species; but, if it be not so, I wish to be understood, as reasoning so for a few minutes. Proceeding then from this point; I conceive there is a philosophy in mechanics, in the arts, in the sciences, &c. &c. and in politics. The philosophy of politics, I conceive to be the understanding them, on the pure principles of positive truth, so as to exclude error. He is a good politician, whose understanding is such, as enable him to move the machine of government upon erring principles.

Mr. Foster says, "that two independent legislatures may exist, on commerce being settled; but, that two independent legislatures, and unsettled commerce, cannot exist." I cannot tell how to understand this Gentleman's mode of reasoning; because, he has before taken great pains to say, that commerce and legislation are separate and distinct things; and, he has taken particular pains to desire his hearers to mark those expressions. He now blends them so closely together, and interweaves them so completely into one another, that they become totally inseparable; this I call strange logic; and, if it be not strange logic, it does not, according to my mode, exhibit much of the philosophy of politics.

I seems complete murder to all his own arguments, to say that unsettled commerce will prevent the existence of two independent legislatures. In saying this, he says every thing which he possibly can say, against the glorious settlement of 1782. And, in saying, "two independent legislatures," may exist, on commerce being settled; is like saying, that, two lines drawn from a point, and continued in opposite tangents, would be sure of meeting at their extremity.

Two distinct legislatures, by being distinct things, and capable of acting differently; and, by being capable of acting differently, they may produce different effects; and different effects are liable to produce discord; the principles of two independent legislatures dragged adverse ways by different interests, are, consequently, not only liable but are likely, to produce discord; and that discord may interrupt the harmony of the two kingdoms, of England and Ireland. These arguments, therefore, make very pointed ones against Mr. Foster. But, one entire legislature, having no division of parts, must have complete uniformity in its operations.

tions ; and for that reason, cannot possibly produce discord ; because it has nothing to *oppose* it. This, then, instantly, winds up the reasoning of the mind, and forces it to its conclusion ; that one entire thing, having no divided parts, cannot but be complete and uniform in its action, and, therefore, totally excludes the possibility of contradiction. How strongly, then, does this expose Mr. Foster's arguments against two independent legislatures, and point to the wisdom of a complete intirety by an Union.

The circumstance of admitting two independent legislatures, in one constitution, acting upon *separate* interests, is no proof of the superior knowledge of the philosophy of politics being much exercised at the time of such admission ; but, there might be other reasons for suffering it at that moment, or it would not have been done ; and those reasons, I think, I have already mentioned. Mr. Pitt aims to restore this complete intirety, by an Union ; and, it is a proof of the clearness of his intellect, as well as of the correctness of his political philosophy.

Two independent legislatures, acting distinctly, but, demanding collision, and unison of action and re-action to become harmonious, are very likely to be out of order—It is too slender a thread to suspend the *harmony* of the empire upon ; and no wise legislator would hazard it for a moment longer than he could help it. Mr. Foster is, however, a determined advocate for the suspension upon the thread ; while Mr. Pitt wants to fix that harmony upon the solid basis of the British Constitution.

To prove that the harmony of the two countries hangs upon a thread, it will only be necessary to observe ; that, at present, it requires the unanimity of temper, precision of

thinking, similarity of views, and accordance of action, of the members of both the legislatures to preserve it. And, if these be not difficult points, I know none that are so. Yet separate interests are continually dividing them.—On this thread it hangs.

To digress a little further. According to my mode of thinking, a legislator cannot be a legislator without being a philosopher.

A member of a legislature, is a legislator only, in proportion as he is a philosopher; and, the superior knowledge of principles, and truths, with a disposition to act up to that knowledge, and those principles and truths, it is, that constitutes superiority in legislators: And, by this rule it is, that Mr. Pitt may be known. I have no intention of lavishing praises on Mr. Pitt, nor on any man, without knowing them to be just, and unless I thought they were such, as his own private thoughts would not give the lie to; because, if I did, I should expect to be trebly despised—despised by Mr. Pitt, despised by the world; and what would be more to me than both—despised by myself—as I think all gross encomiums an insult to human dignity. But, to return.

Mr. Pitt asks, “Is the evil of commercial jealousies acting upon the laws of two *independent* legislatures to be remedied? And, answers, by two means only; either “by some contract entered into by the legislatures of the “two countries, or else by blending the two legislatures “together. And, adds, I defy the wit of man, to produce “a third.” To which Mr. Foster observes, ‘I answer, ‘his own conduct, and that of both the kingdoms have ‘pointed out a third.’ This is the very third I expected to hear of, from Mr. Foster, and which is that I have just

described, as the one which wise legislators will consider the worst which can possibly exist, viz. that *depending* upon the *temper* of the persons of the legislators, liable to contradiction, discord, and mischief. This is the power, which, I think, ought to be destroyed; the identical power I have just exposed; the self-same weed which is sought to be thrown out of the parterre; and which must be destroyed before one complete intirety of beautiful legislation can be established; so as for *ever* to exclude the possibility of discordancy in the grand machine of the true philosophic politics, by which men ought wisely to govern a great and powerful empire, like Great Britain.

How, therefore, Mr. Foster could be so unfortunate as to break his nose against this door-post, can only be accounted for, either by the ingenuity of Mr. Pitt, in thus entrapping his mind; or, by the errors of his judgement, on the nice and profound points in which the excellent philosophers on legislative principles, like Mr. Pitt, &c: are better skilled. It is clear that Mr. Pitt, could allude to *rational* points only; when, speaking of those by which the evil of commercial jealousies could be remedied; and, when, he said, he defied the wit of man to point out a third; he could not suppose any legislator so weak as to suffer himself to fall into such an error. This is, however, an additional proof of the clearness of his head—the correctness of his understanding—and the supremacy of his philosophy. These points established; every minor consideration, dependent upon them, falls to the ground; and, I should here conclude, but, that some further extraordinary reasoning, has been used.

Mr. Foster lays much stress on the harmony which subsists between the two countries; but, presently after, speaking of peace and war, reasons thus—"Suppose then,

“ the British Parliament to approve a war, and that Ireland, should disapprove, the ONLY difficulty,—mark the words; —the only difficulty which this difference of settlement could create, would be, that, the one who disapproved, might withhold its supplies until good sense should induce it to acquiesce.” Now we are arrived at this point, it becomes unavoidable in me to retort.

Mr. Foster admits, that, in May, 1782, a bill passed the legislature of Ireland, enacting, that “ no bill shall pass into a law, in Ireland, unless it be returned under the Great Seal of Great Britain; and that in thus rendering the Seal of Great Britain necessary to the passing of an Irish law, a *theoretic* difference was created in the constitutions of the two kingdoms, which renders Ireland inferior.”

This establishes two points,—the authority of Great Britain over Ireland; and that the withholding the supplies becomes, of course, a disobedience; from which, a constitutional question arises, and exists, such as must interrupt the harmony of the two kingdoms. The refusal of the supplies would be constitutional in the English Commons; but, the moment the British House of Commons had voted its supplies, the refusal of Ireland becomes a disobedience; and of course, a question of constitution; such as would interrupt the harmony of the two kingdoms. Thus, then, the whole fabric hangs on a mere thread; by being suspended on the temper and passions of the individuals, composing the Commons of Ireland; and on which, hangs the only perpetual pledge of mutual amity we have from Ireland, under the so much boasted glorious settlement of 1782; for, Mr. Foster tells us, that, “ by the confirmation of our independence, British laws cannot bind us.”

It cannot be said, that commercial disputes, refusal of

supplies, and unsuppressible rebellions are *distinct* from the objects of constitution; for, that would be dividing, and refining the metal, until nothing was left in the crucible.—Can a rebellion, which Ireland alone has not power to suppress, be said not to create a question of constitution? A rebellion, which would, by this time, have deprived Ireland of all manner of constitution whatever? Could a refusal of the supplies, as the connexion, at present, exists between England and Ireland, be said not to be a constitutional question?—That alone is a question of constitution, sufficient for the consideration of a wise government: And, as is it *possible* for such a question to arise, means ought to be taken to prevent it; and those means cannot be found in reiterated grants to Ireland, by which she will become proud and insolent; but, by a consolidation of the strength of both kingdoms into one undivided, indivisible, imperial constitution.

If ever the supplies, after being granted in England, should be refused in Ireland, I predict, that a dreadful concussion will follow; and, that if an Union should not take place before, it will then. Either the Irish Commons must not dare to refuse the supplies, in not doing which, they will loose their independence; or, they must run the risk of refusing them, and take the consequences. From that refusal, a question of constitution will arise; whether the British Commons having voted them, that of Ireland can refuse; or, whether the British House of Commons, by being paramount to that of Ireland, will not be deemed a majority of the third branch of the legislature, and that of Ireland, the minority. In which case, Ireland must raise the supplies; and her refusal will stand for nothing.

If ever this event should happen, I would recommend to Ireland to consent to this latter discision, as their only

resource to avoid a constitutional question; which will, at once, totally annihilate her legislature.

The folly and mischief of different legislatures in the same nation, we have experienced in the be-kinged counties, and in the Heptarchy; and a separate legislature in Ireland, is the only *relief* of that folly and nonsense; more extended in point of population and cumference of soil, and only more *limited* by judicious restrictions.

It is not the most generous and liberal mode of a reasoning, I ever heard, when a gentleman uses expressions like these:—"Roll of parchment against inclination, interest, and feeling;—bonds of force;—deluded discontent;—bonds to be broken;—galling shape of fetters; provocation to throw them off." Expressions, like these, give a right to retort, in similar and applicable terms, if I chose to allow my passions the liberality of knocking out the brains of my reason. It is the language of anarchy, and deserves only one reply which will be more decent in thought than on paper. But, I will tell Mr. Foster, that if the people of Ireland, will believe the doctrines laid down in his speech, they would have believed a contrary doctrine, if he had laid it down; and, I am sure, that as he boasts of the advantages obtained for the people of Ireland, under the present limited, and inadequate, regulations; they would have, indeed, reason to rejoice at the *boundless* benefits which would result from an equal consolidation of Ireland, into the British Empire—participating in that steady security—inexhaustible *wealth*—matured civilization—and individual happiness; which extends to every inch of ground in the whole kingdom of England, and which does *not* extend to Ireland. And, Mr. Foster will have to answer for all he has done to exclude those benefits from his country.

That Gentleman, is not, perhaps, aware of the consequences of his sneer at a roll of parchment. What are the acts of the Irish legislature contained in, but a roll of parchment, which is never seen by the people? He should reflect on what he says, and ask himself what the Speaker of the House of his Commons would be, if the people of Ireland, were to tell him, that his rolls of parchment were nothing to them. This is, certainly, a doctrine, not the most commendable in the Speaker of a legislative assembly. It is not the way to support the power of the constituted authorities.

If the prosperity and happiness of the people of Ireland, be objects in the Speaker's mind, paramount to every other; what does it signify to the people, whether they are governed by one Grand Imperial Legislature, in its proper and direct divisions of one King, one House of Lords, and one House of Commons; or, whether the two latter are split off into two separate tangents—that separate further the longer they are continued, as two independent legislatures do; so that they are but governed to their advantage. And, who is he, that will talk so idly, as to say, that the happiness and prosperity of every part of the people of Great Britain, are not equally objects of the care and attention of the British Legislature.

Another question, then, arises of some moment—whether England, with all her riches, resources, stability, and judgment, as the superior government, cannot protect and cherish, the people of Ireland, much more to their own advantage, than they can be by a power partly deputed; who have received from Great Britain, that which she so lavishly boasts—the means of her present power and prosperity?—Aye, infinitely more so; for, I am sure, that power which has been able to give Ireland the advantages she has, would find it her interest to rescue the miserable peasant from his

pigsty-hut, and give him the free, Christian-like, and comfortable home, and independence, of a British cottager. Does not Mr. Foster know; does not every one know, the miserable state of the peasantry of Ireland—and, the theme of complaint it has ever been, with every one, who knows it: and, will he, then, have the inhumanity to raise his own voice against their redemption from that misery; by a scheme fraught with the highest benevolence which could enter the human bosom.—An Union with this kingdom, which raises the miserable from a pig-sty to a mansion; from sloth and ignorance, to industry and knowledge; from poverty and distress, to plenty and peace; and from despair and agony, to hope and joy. Does Mr. Foster mean to say, the *People* of Ireland are his object; or, that the personal consequence of the present legislators is? If the former, 'tis well; if the latter, what has he not to answer?—I hope he is too honest a man to put one into the scale against the other: and, I am sure, nine-tenths, at least, of the present legislators of Ireland, have such hearts, that they would, instantly, assemble in parliament, and politically annihilate themselves, if they were aware the people of Ireland would be materially benefited by so doing: both which, I presume to predict, will eventually be the result. What is the present Constitution of Ireland, worth to the people, if it stand up as a barrier to their prosperity and happiness? It were better that it should be tumbled instantly to atoms, than that it should so stand one moment.

If I can form any judgement from the late organized rebellion, and from the poverty and ignorance of the lower class, if not the majority, of the Irish people; it must be a long time before the glorious settlement of 1782, will emancipate them from their piteous state. The blessings which have been “showered down upon Ireland,” do not appear to have reached the people generally.—Perhaps, Mr. Foster has been

only in the showery parts of that kingdom, and has not had an opportunity of viewing the general state of the people—but, yet, one should have thought, that the penetrating eye of the mind of a great and good legislator, would have explored their miserable abodes, and have known their chilling poverty, their rueful ignorance, their dreadful ferocity, their piteous poverty, and all their horrible train of attendants. This might have been expected; but, it has been very little enlarged upon, in this speech; although the country is, at this moment, bleeding under their effects. Those men, therefore, who shall dare to rescue these beings from their present situation, at the expence of their own political consequence, will deserve what they will have, the pleasure of a consciences paradise, in the reflection that they have done what they ought, as benevolent, upright, and wise men; acting as national trustees, and absorbing *self* into the general good.

Were I to ask the greatest enemy to the Union, whether he really thinks the people of Ireland would lose one iota of the liberties, commercial advantages, or any other benefits, they at present possess? He must answer, *No*. Were I then ask him, if they would not have numberless other benefits, added to those they have now, instead of being deprived of them; and, his answer must be *Yes*. What, then, will be lost by an Union? Nothing, but the *personal* consequence of part of the members of the present legislature. What is that worth?—nothing, to me, or my fellow-subjects, must be the answer; and there end all disputes on the subject. This *self*—this desire to participate in authority—this pride to be a governor—and this passion to be a director of national affairs, it is, that occasions this opposition.

Few can, or will, agree, with Mr. Foster, in his mode of reasoning on the theory of the different branches of the constitution; because they are mere amusements of juvenile logic. Does it follow, that, because two divisions of the third legislative estate of two kingdoms should be incorporated into one, or, four into two, by which they become more powerful; is the way to become annihilated?—Does, I say, an *increase* of power, look like its *diminution*? How absurd is this reasoning, if reasoning it may be called? Besides, it is quite opposite to all Mr. Foster's arguments; for the chief ones he uses are that; Ireland having obtained an increase of power and independence, by the settlement of 1782—for *that* reason, should for ever continue an independent legislature, for the purpose of *encreasing* her power. So two parliaments, by an addition of members from Ireland, the guardian of whose interests they would ever be, must, certainly “add to the mass of wisdom, unite the strength, and increase the power of those two branches;” which would, in the opinion of every sensible man, be less likely to be surrendered or consolidated in the office of the Monarch, by that increase of strength. By this, I conclude, Mr. Foster has given another blow to his own arguments.

With regard to Mr. Pitt's position respecting local knowledge of Ireland, I do not think him right; but, think Mr. Foster so; yet it proves nothing; because, the members of the Imperial legislature would not be without that local knowledge; as they would reside in Ireland, the greater part of the year. To call the project of an Union a theory it a misnomer, for, we have had practical experience of it in Scotland; and, although, I know some gentlemen will turn away at the mention of Scotland, still, I think, Scotland should be

reiterated in their ears, so long as their ears are ears, and Scotland is Scotland.

The observations of Mr. Foster, respecting Ireland never having had the *will* to clog the progress of the Empire, amount to but little—it is not the *will* we are speaking of; but, it is the *power*, which is of infinite import;—while the will, is a very inferior consideration. Why, then, lay so much stress upon the will, which is nothing, and be wholly silent on the power, which is every thing?

The wild theoretic scheme of modern philosophers to reform the system of the British Constitution, will, like a meteor, put itself out. The business of an Union with Ireland is totally different in its nature. The idea of restraint upon the trade of Ireland, is idle; because, no man is so weak as to take a farm to let it lie uncultivated. This is, therefore, confuted by the absurdity of its own position. As to taxation—the Irishman, who cannot pay a tax of one shilling, under the present *glorious* settlement, may be enabled to pay an hundred: And, if he should be enabled to pay an hundred, and should only pay ten, he will have reason to be grateful for that measure, which shall thus give him wealth.—It is certain, no man can pay what he does not possess—if he have nothing, he can pay nothing; and, if, therefore, Mr. Pitt should want to tax the people of Ireland, he must want also to give them property to be taxed; for, it seems the majority have at present nothing—thus, this reasoning is also, idle. Taxation, or no taxation; such are the benefits which will shortly arise to Ireland, from an Union of the two kingdoms, that the people of Ireland will have reason to raise a statue in gratitude to Mr. Pitt, which shall stride the channel, and stand with one foot in each kingdom.

On the subject of the Regency; the arguments I have before adduced, respecting them; and, the power of the Irish legislature will apply. Will is not power; nor is power will; but, it is unnecessary for me to say more on this subject; as it has been much discussed by others. The connection still hangs by the thread.

Speaking of surrendering the legislative independence; the worth and unworthiness of the persons of the legislators, seems still the paramount objection; because it rests on the word *Independence*.

Mr. Foster says, that "one argument which the advocates for the Union urge is, that it will augment the general force of the empire. Were it calculated to produce that effect, we ought to sacrifice much to such an attainment; but do they prove it; no, nor even attempt an argument; they give general terms, pompous phrases, and unsupported assertions, and speak of us as if there were no Union, as if we were actually separate, and then attribute to their project every merit, every advantage, which we now enjoy, as if they could confer them, and as if they did not exist. The case is, we are now united, so as if our whole strength is the strength of the empire. And as to resources against the enemy, the consolidation of both kingdoms is as firm as human policy and individual interest can make it."

If, then, Mr. Foster admits, we are actually united, and the consolidation of the resources of both kingdoms is as firm as human policy, and individual interest can make it; an Union can only be a mere matter of formality. As then, the Union is, according to this doctrine, nothing more than mere form; why object; why not

assent to it, as there can be no harm in it, merely to satisfy mens' minds, as matter of form?

The reason, however, which presently follows, seems contradictory of that which precedes it. Mr. Foster says, will the removal of parliament, i.e. the Union, procure one soldier, or one guinea more?—*Before*, that Gentleman says, that Mr. Pitt “wants an Union in order to tax you;” *now*, he implies, that it will not raise one guinea more.—These strange contradictions puzzle me much; and I begin to be at a loss to connect the arguments. Presently after, I receive a volley of debilitations, debasings, drainings, weakenings, dispiriting, tardiness, discontents, and inanimations; so that if the last should not speedily prove final to me, I must send for Dr. Fogoni.

Another blunder. In the former part of this speech, the Right Hon. Gentleman says, Mr. Pitt, is a good financier; but the worst minister he ever met with; and, presently, says; “the sound discretion which has ever marked his policy as a statesman.” The British minister too, is blamed for exposing the vulnerable state of Ireland, to the enemy—he would not have done so, if he had not known, that he could defeat her attacks; and, he knew, also, that if that enemy did make an attack, a few ships, ready built, might save us that expence; and, also, that they would be very useful to a commercial country, like Great Britain. And, with respect to the present connexion of the two countries; the enemy is not so very ignorant as to have that to learn in 1799, which was settled in 1782. And, so with respect to the vulnerable state of Ireland, which he blames Mr. Pitt for exposing.

A resident parliament, and resident gentry have *not* softened the manners of the people of Ireland—this experience has proved. It follows, then, that other measures are wanting.—And what is so likely as that which experience has proved to be effectual? In England and in Scotland, the manners of the people have been softened. And the Union, is well calculated to effect that end; which nothing ever yet could reach in Ireland. But if the present system were to remain for ever, the same ferocity and ignorance would remain with the people, and the same blame would be attached to their governors. And, here Mr. Foster is welcome to exclaim, “forbid it heaven, forbid it, &c. &c.

How shocking it ought to appear to the bosom of every feeling man, to learn, as we do, from Mr. Foster's own lips, that the people of Ireland, are in the most complete state of human ignorance and barbarism—To the sad description he has before given, he now adds, “That if every estate, and every village afforded a “benevolent protector, an easy and impartial dispenser “of justice, and allayer of the feuds, which head- “strong passions, untamed by education, are too apt to “carry to the last excesses, the lower orders would not “only learn obedience and veneration to the laws; but, “would feel an attachment to the country that afforded “them such blessings.”—Alas! he has more than once admitted, this is *not* the case—here it is impossible for the human heart to pass without a sigh of the most heart-felt pity—to pity, indeed, are the people of Ireland intitled; but that will do them no good; human sympathy, however will linger here; and the mind would willingly set about means to relieve them—it would, instantly, enter into all the perfectioned theories of which it is so eminently capable—and, if there were no obstacles, they would be relieved;

but again, alas! there are obstacles. And the first that presents itself, is Mr. Foster; the next, is those Gentlemen who think as he does; another, the independence of the legislature; and a fourth of the glorious settlement of 1782; by which the people are confined in the miserable goal just now, and before, described by Mr. Foster.

From this indulgence of pity, for the poor sufferers; the human mind rushes into the opposite extreme; and must execrate that system which holds them in such a state—the mind will call for the most effectual vengeance, and wish the independence of the legislature, and, the glorious settlement of 1782, hurled headlong into chaos. And yet, Mr. Foster says, that every thing is so finally adjusted, that *no* alteration, whatever, can possibly take place.—For shame, Sir! Have you no dread that the souls now confined in purgatory, shall haunt your broken slumbers—souls doomed there, by their poverty, misery, and ignorance, to which their posterity is eternally doomed by the final adjustment of the glorious settlement of 1782. Are you not alarmed, lest the souls of that condemned sufferers for the recent rebellion, should present themselves to your view at mid-day, and charge their blood upon that adjustment—that settlement, or its advocates.—Do, Sir, pause and reflect—first examine the perversion of words, and expressions, in your speech, “the tranquility of Ireland—unexampled prosperity—the blessings we enjoy—our unalterable state—the final adjustment,” and your political self.—Examine, also, if, when you were young, your mother corrected your froward temper; your headstrong passions; and your obstinacy of mind—or, whether those passions have been suffered to grow strong with your strength—to encrease with your years—to become ungovernable in your age—matured by ability—mischievous by maturity—and dangerous from consequence.—Analyse yourself, Sir, and

then, tell me, whether you could not very materially contribute to the removal of the miseries of your fellow-subjects, were you to forget *yourself*; and act for *them*; under the plan of an Union. Ask yourself if all the schemes hitherto put into practice, in Ireland, have not failed to render the people what they ought to, and might, have been; and you have already answered, *yes*.—Then, suppose, the Union even a very bad thing;—and ask yourself, if the people of Ireland can be worse with the Union, than they are at present? and your answer must be *No*.—Then you might be right in concluding, that as nothing can render their condition worse; you will support any thing that shall come; because, as it cannot be worse, it may be better. But an Union carries no threats to the people—it bears with it experimental proof of its happy influence, in the instance of Scotland.—This offer of an Union, ought to be considered as the *parent* of the Empire, stretching out his arm to receive his *prodigal son* to his bosom—to foster and nourish—to restore and to protect—and to enrich and to exalt him. And, therefore, you would prove, to England, to Ireland, and to all the world; that you do, indeed, wish well to the people of Ireland, by determining to encourage and support any thing, be it what it would, which should be likely to better their condition; under the positive certainty, that it *cannot* be worse.

But this, I am afraid, Mr. Foster has no design of doing; and, I am sorry to have heard language so perverted, and judgement so misapplied, as in the following passage, “but
“it has remained for Mr. Pitt, to advance a new system,
“that depriving a country of those persons, whom I have
“described (absentees)—mark the word, *persons*; en-
“couraging land jobbers; and land pirates; degrading
“the hospitality of old mansion-houses into the niggardly
“penury of agent’s dwellings; is the most approved,

“modern mode, of making happy—and contented tenants
 “—of forming good men and subjects.” The word *persons* here proves, that the political consequence of the individual is the sublime objection to Mr. Pitt’s measure; and as to the rest of the passage, it cannot apply to that which does not yet exist; but will, indeed, well apply to the state of Ireland under the *glorious* settlement of 1782.

The Brutish manners of the peasantry, the unimproved state of the country, the narrow boundaries of wealth, and the few objects of delight, which Ireland at present affords to a Gentleman; are forbidding in the extreme; and drive him away. The country must have inticements—suavity of manners—cultivated objects—varied classes of society—and mixture of character.—These, the present system has not produced; nor can it: Its self-counteracting nature renders it incapable of effecting such an alteration. An Union may produce all of them—Without them, Ireland will always be as Ireland now is.

How can Mr. Foster speak of “a parliament unacquainted with the local circumstances of a kingdom it never sees?” Will he say the Irish members of the Imperial Legislature, will reside in Ireland the greater part of the year? If so, he is wrong—if otherwise, and only a small part, his reasoning falls.

The late treasons and rebellion which have degraded Ireland, were known to the British Minister, long before they were recognised in Ireland; so *that* argument is futile. And if that country had been governed by an Imperial parliament, sitting in Great Britain, no such rebellion would ever have existed; because, the people, under the circumstances and benefits of a Union, would have

been employed in *enjoying* their happy state; instead of *seeking* it through the dark and dangerous path of rebellion. But if a rebellion had arisen, the unanimous importance of an Imperial legislature would have awed it into nothing, the moment it had appeared.

Its authority would, like a clap of thunder, have shaken it to its very centre; while the *feeble* voice of an inferior legislature was scarcely heard. Nor would it have been heard at all, but for the thunder which was getting ready in England.

Look to England—look to Scotland—look to Wales—What then? Why there is nothing to compare with the ignorance and wretchedness of Ireland; and what cannot be *worse* may be *better*.

Mr. Foster says, “In an island blest with soil, climate, and situation, beyond most islands in the Globe, industry and wealth must increase; and if you will but obtain from experiment; civilization and ameliorated manners will be the sure attendants.” When? Have they been so? No—Experience gives it a flat contradiction.

How happens it, that this fine soil, climate, and situation have *not* produced industry and wealth, civilization, and an amelioration of manners?—Why, either because the Government has been ill directed; or that, the glorious settlement of 1782, has been inadequate. If the former, what is to be thought of the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons; if the latter, what of Mr. Foster?

As to the manufactures of wool, cotton, and pottery wares; they *never having* been in Ireland, cannot be effected by an union; and, therefore, all that is said on those subjects is inapplicable.

Without entering into the minutiae of diffusing British capital in Ireland, I will only observe, that, it is not diffused there at present; but it may under a regulation which puts the people into a condition that shall enable them to trade. And, I think, the quotation of Mr. Pitt's speech on this subject is very fatal to Mr. Foster's own arguments, wherein Mr. Pitt says that it was an absurd idea, "that a poor country, merely because she enjoyed some comparative exemption from taxes, was, therefore, able to cope with a rich and powerful country."

This poverty, is the very thing which excludes trade and manufacture from Ireland, and while it continues, they must for ever be excluded; and that this poverty will exist as long as the present system remains, is certain. But the intention of the union is to exclude poverty, introduce manufacture and raise the people into affluence.

As to the linen manufacture, most of the same arguments hold—Men will not barter all the delights of an improved and beautified kingdom, and a polished and tempered people, for the mere grovelling advantage of getting money only, in that manufactory, which they must spend like hogs. When that country shall possess those allurements, monied men will go with less inviting objects than the linen manufacture.

Mr. Foster, says, "let me tell you, that we are as free to trade with all the world, as Great Britain is—agreed—why then is it not done? the answer is; we have not the means! Of what use is the being free, without the means—This reminds me of a man who said,—I have a great spirit; and, I have a large purse; but it is empty. The Union, however, will fill it; with Mr.

Foster's permission; and this is what Mr. Pitt aims at; but, Mr. Foster is so great a *friend* to the people of Ireland, that he seems determined to oppose it, because he *thinks* he will.

Mr. Foster has pretty much enlarged on the value and importance of the linen manufacture; and given statements of accounts, &c. which will do no good for me to understand; but I learn one very important point from the language intermixed with those statements; namely, that from the menaces of the British Minister; and those retaliated by Mr. Foster; it is possible, and not unlikely, that the *harmony* of the two countries may be interrupted, in the present order of things; which is of more importance than all the other considerations put together;—It points out strongly the fallacy of the present settlement. It exposes another very vulnerable part of it. It betrays the possibility of interruption to the interests and harmony of the two countries; and is consequently, another, additional, and very important proof, that further and better measures are indispensibly necessary to secure the interests and harmony of the two countries, than the thread on which they hang at present.

In answer to Mr. Foster's *proof*, that the union would injure the trade and manufacture of Ireland; it should be observed, that he begins with the preposition if, "If," says he, "it takes as it must do, a great portion of the men of property to England, the manufacturers will be deprived of their best customers to the extent of what they heretofore spent."—How much is that?—Why the consumption of goods of Irish manufacture, of 100 members of parliament at 20*l.* per annum is 2000*l.* suppose they continue the whole year in England—This is important, like

the 10,000 copies of Mr. Pitt's speech; because 2000 a year must certainly ruin the people of Ireland, although they may get *ten millions* by the operations of the union.

If it encreases absentees, says Mr. Foster, it will reduce more estates to the miserable state of uncultivation, in which theirs generally are. It has been proved, that the absentees are drawn from Ireland, for want of inviting objects; and *that* absence will continue so long as the present state of the country continues, which will not alter any thing worth notice under the present settlement, for five centuries to come: this, then, instead of being an argument against an union, is a very strong one in favor of it; or even of *any thing*, which should alter the state of Ireland. Under the union that state would be altered, and would entice 500 residents for one absentee; but this is opposed.

As to the present duties ceasing, no doubt they would, as they ought. At present, they exist *against* Great Britain, chiefly.—But does Mr. Foster idly imagine others more beneficial would not be instantly substituted.—Not against *Great Britain*; but against all the rest of the world, in favor of both Ireland and Great Britain, which would, under the union, be as one; and does not that gentleman know, *that* would be infinitely more advantageous to Ireland? Or does he think, it would be the interest of Great Britain to destroy herself, by destroying Ireland. How imbecile are these arguments! We know the Irish import duties, on some raw materials, are fitted to the infant state of that country; and, of course, would be nourished accordingly.

It is insanity to suppose the corn laws, and every other law requiring partial encouragement, would not be care-

fully cherished; and it is a libel on the legislature, to say they could not distinguish the objects demanding that attention; especially when there were 100 Irish members always present in the Imperial parliament, with their instructions, on all occasions.

How can Mr. Foster speak of the loss of the protection of parliament, when 100 members will exist with the full powers of the present legislature, assisted by the whole British Senate; whose interest it will be, in every point, to protect and nourish Ireland, as part of *themselves*.

“Every law, every regulation, which you now value, will be subject to repeal” says, Mr. Foster. Are they not so at present; and what prevents it? Why the good of the country—The same answer will be given for their not being repealed, by an imperial parliament. “New laws equal in appearance and phrase, may be very unequal in effect to countries differently situated.” This implies a supposition that an Irish legislature, in England, could not carry their knowledge from Ireland to England; or, that an imperial legislature, could not discriminate; or would not keep in view, as a mariner does his compass, those points which have successfully directed the course.

“The people will feel, that their prosperity and happiness are given back again to the controul of a British Parliament.” What then? Why that magnanimous parliament, will *return* them, pure and perfect, with centuple advantages, as will be their interest. Ireland is at present little better than a desolate country, and wants renovation, which it must have; and with very different powers from what the present legislature of that country is

able to give it. In short, it wants the father's patrimony, to set it up in business; and the union will produce it.

Mr. Foster has also, some apprehensions, that the union may, after a time, be abandoned—to which I answer; a man may destroy *himself*. But, if the union should ever be abandoned; I have no doubt, but the British Legislature will admit of provision in the articles of union, that Ireland shall, in such case, be placed in precisely the same situation, in every respect, as at the time of the union.

In viewing the taxes laid on in Scotland, not particularly specified in the union, an answer has been before given.—They cannot pay what they have not; and if under the union they acquire the means, they will have reason to be both grateful and glad.

According to Mr. Foster's statement, the parliament of Ireland, has done *wonders* for the people; and yet, they are miserable, distressed, and ignorant! It is to be hoped, that acts of an imperial parliament will *not* produce these effects.

In short; these points which I have noticed, are those which, according to Mr. Foster, Ireland has to dread; except Cork; which is to be corked up in a bottle, and sent swimming down the ocean. That no naval dock-yard has been established at Cork, is mentioned as a matter of regret. But presently afterwards, Mr. Foster intimates that it would do no good to it; for he says, if they look at "Plymouth, Portsmouth, &c. they will see that no "trade exists where those great naval dock yards are established." Perhaps, then, this may be the reason; or else, that we could beat our enemies without it.

He says, "In preserving this constitution, we preserve
 "the *means* of trade." I say no—only the liberty to
 trade; which, without the *means*, is of no value. "We
 "have that to lose for which Englishmen of every age
 "have fought and bled; which our ancestors gloriously
 "preserved in battle; and for the preservation of which
 "the British Empire is now engaged in the most arduous
 war—Liberty, says Mr. Foster. And, I will add; not for
 Great Britain alone; but for both Great Britain, and
 Ireland.

Why will Mr. Foster thus strive to keep the two coun-
 tries at a distance? Are not England and Ireland as *one*—
 From whom did Ireland *recieve* those liberties? From Eng-
 land—And does England want to take them away? No.
 What then? To encrease them, by the addition of every
 one she herself enjoys, and to return those they have,
 with that addition, pure and perfect; and to cherish and
 protect Ireland as part of herself.

What impolitic nonsense, then, is this of Mr. Foster,
 when he talks of the banishment of wealth, the vanishing
 of freedom, the surrender of liberty?

We have next to observe, in this speech, matter of this
 sort—"It may with the same power that it removes the
 "Irish parliament out of the realm of Ireland, remove
 "the British parliament to Jersey, Guernsey, the West
 "Indies, or the Isle of Man. In the course of reasoning
 "it may put down any branch of the Constitution,
 "and justify the usurpation of Cromwell; and if, and if,
 "and if, &c. &c. &c." I believe it is unnecessary for me
 to observe on such matter, as it will sufficiently expose
 itself.

My Readers, will see that I have avoided going into any arguments respecting the union, further than I was unavoidably led by the Right Honorable Speaker; but I am of opinion, that had that gentleman *intended* to have delivered a speech in *favor* of an union, it could not well have been more to the purpose than this of the 11th of April; and Mr. Pitt, is certainly indebted to the speaker for this assistance, although it does not *appear* directly to have that aim.

This labored speech, concludes with an appeal to the *passions*. And here I shall conclude with observing, that I have chosen those arguments to answer, and those quotations for examination, which the Speaker has selected as the most powerful in his support; and if I have succeeded in exposing some of his strongest arguments, it is not unreasonable to infer that the weaker ones would not stand the shock of deliberate discussion in a legislative assembly, where there is scope for ability uncircumscribed by the narrow limits of a pamphlet.

Were I disposed to enter on the subject of the Union, I conceive, there are arguments which may be used very different from any that have been yet thought of.—Arguments which are, indeed, interesting to humanity—which touch upon both *time* and *eternity*—which affect both *body* and *soul*—which go directly to the objects of *Deity* in his creation of mankind.—But, *patriots* generally fasten upon those points, prevent the people from coming near them, invert their *true* end, and convert them to their own use.

That is called *patriotism*, which, under the pretence of respecting the *legitimate* authority of an empire, covers a people with curses, by the establishment of a partial, limit-

ted, ineffective government ;—a government which does not reach the necessities of the people ; but engenders *Will o' th' wisp* guides that beguile them out of the high-road of constitutional security, into the deep bog of inextricable destruction.

That is denominated patriotism, which arises in the minds of these *phantoms* of political guides, out of a fondness for their *own* existence, and an attachment to their absurd habits ; and from a dread of an annihilation of their *shades*. Or it may be considered as the last effort of *debilitated dotage*, apeing *love* in the *act* of *expiring*—which ever shews itself in *fury* while the *powers* remain ; but on their decay, soon dwindles into the *whining* of an aged *infant*.—Is a people to be sacrificed for such *stuff* ?

Let the present system of Ireland under the glorious settlement of 1782, be viewed through the optics of the British Constitution, possessing, as it does, her pristine and vigorous powers, and its deformities will be glaring—Deformities which are perpetually distressing the whole nation. Let one clear, perfect, and comprehensive view of the whole system be taken without partiality or prejudice, and I defy any honest man to lay his hand on his heart, and declare *that all is right*.

If the patriots of Ireland oppose the measure of an Union with a view as they may *think*, to enhance their *price*, let them take care that detection of their principles does not expose them to resentment and contempt. If they are to found their consequence upon the extent and manœuvre of their opposition, and upon actions which have no other merit than the *possibility* of performing them, let them recollect the injuries of a people will be answered for. The first vengeance may send them to those they have

abused, by a *dissolution*, and ANOTHER *dissolution* of their organised state; and that thus providence shall, by one of his less inscrutable ways, *humble* them to their own *slaves*. But, that if they should *escape* in this world, however lightly they may consider the *tribunal* of the Conscience, they will have shortly to meet the lightening-like eye of an offended Deity; who will not be regardless of the *cries* of his people.

In short, let these patriots reflect, that they will have to answer for the distresses of a nation—for the injuries of a people—for the strife of contending factions. Let them recollect the genuine purposes of human existence; and act accordingly. Let leading individuals recollect, that after all the various struggles for political distinction, and the amassment of wealth, that very little is necessary to individual happiness—that much is due to a people whose trustees they are,—that much will be demanded both here, and hereafter—and, that there is one general and never-failing guide for all mankind to *right* actions, which is to do as they would be done by.—*Amen*.

FINIS.

of their
 appointed them; and that the providence that, by one of
 his late inimitable works, has been shown to their own
 that, that if they had not been in this world, however
 likely they may come to the way of the Conscience,
 they will have shortly to meet the lightning-like eye of an
 offended deity; who will not be regarded of the earth
 of his people.



ERRATA.

In those of these parts, they will have to
 answer for the dishonour of a nation—for the injuries of a
 people—for the
 Page 6, line 18---delegation, *read* délegation.
 Page 14, line 24---*dele* and.
 Page 52, line 16---liberality, *read* liberty.
 Pages 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54
to be
 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44.
 all the various things
 of wealth, that very little is necessary to induce
 that much is due to a people's whole
 they are—that much will be rewarded both here and
 however—and, that there is one general and never failing
 gain for all mankind to right actions, which is to do as